

## Portland State University PDXScholar

---

Faculty Senate Monthly Packets

University Archives: Faculty Senate

---

1-1-2000

### Faculty Senate Monthly Packet January 2000

Portland State University Faculty Senate

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes>

---

#### Recommended Citation

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet January 2000" (2000). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. Paper 197.

<http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/197>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Monthly Packets by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**TO:** Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate  
**FR:** Sarah E. Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on January 10, 2000, at 3:00 p.m. in room **53 CH.**

**AGENDA**

- A. Roll
- \*B. Approval of the Minutes of the December 6, 1999, Meeting  
President's Report
- C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
- D. Question Period
  - 1. Questions for Administrators
  - 2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
- E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
  - \*1. Faculty Development Committee Semi-Annual Report - Ketcheson
- F. Unfinished Business
  - \*1. Review of Senate Recommendations regarding University Studies and Writing Requirements - Tetreault
- G. New Business
  - \*1. Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals - Gelmon
  - \*2. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals - Eder
- H. Adjournment

**\*The following documents are included with this mailing:**

B Minutes of the December 6, 1999, Senate Meeting  
F1 6/99 Senate Motion requesting Provost to Review University Studies and Writing Requirement Recommendations  
E1 Faculty Development Committee Semi-Annual Report  
G1 Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals  
G2 Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: **Faculty Senate Meeting, December 6, 1999**  
Presiding Officer: Barbara Sestak  
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

**Members Present:** Agre-Kippenhan, Ames, Anderson, Balshem, Dieterich for Barham, Barton, Beasley, Becker, Carstens for Biolsi, Bleiler, Bodegom, Brennan, Brenner, Brown, Burns, Carpenter, Casperson, Chaille, Chapman, Collins, Cooper, Dieterich, Enneking, Erskine, Farr, Fisher, Fountain, Gelmon, George, Goslin, Goucher, Harmon, Herrington, Hickey, Hoffman, Holloway, Hopp, A.Johnson, D.Johnson, Kenny, Kern, Ketcheson, Koch, Latiolais, Mercer, Morgan, Morgan, O'Grady, Patton, Powell, Pratt, Rectenwald, Robertson, Rogers, Rueter, Sestak, Stevens, Thompson, Williams, Works, Wosley-George, Zelick.

**Alternates Present:** Seely for Fortmiller, Halvorson for Lewis, Hein for Squire

**Members Absent:** Carter, Corcoran, Crawshaw, Ellis, Fuller, Heying, Holliday, L. Johnson, R. Johnson, Kiam, Lowry, Miller-Jones, Neal, Shireman, Sussman, Taggart, Walsh, Watne, Wetzel, Wollner.

### **Ex-officio Members**

**Present:** Dunbar for Alberty, Andrews-Collier, Chun, Davidson, Diman, Eder, Feyerherm, Kenton, Lieberman, Pernsteiner, Pfingsten, Tetreault, Toulan, Vieira, Ward.

### **A. ROLL**

### **B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. The minutes of the November 1, 1999 Meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved, after the Provost's Report, with the following corrections:

p. 20: G.2., 1st sentence, replace "ARC" with SSC

p. 21: G.2., In the first paragraph of discussion:

--delete the last half of the first sentence (after the comma).

--delete the 4th sentence, beginning "In response to a comment by Brenner..."

--in the 6th sentence, beginning "Barham stated that ...", replace "it is transfers more than Freshmen," with "the target group is both transfers and freshmen,"

--in the 8th sentence, beginning "Allen stated...", it should read "the Faculty set the admission requirements..."

### **C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

President Bernstine has approved the actions of the Senate passed at the November 1, 1999, meeting, according to normal governance procedures:

Certificate in Computer Modeling & Simulation, SYSC  
 Certificate in Computational Intelligence, SYSC  
 New courses: USP 537/637 Economics of Urban Transportation  
 SYSC 557/657 Artificial Life

Faculty Development Committee RFP's were distributed in campus mail this week, with the assistance of Kathi Ketcheson, OIRP.

Changes in Senate/Committee Appointments since 1 November:

Marjorie Enneking has resigned from Senate. Her replacement is Tom Dieterich, LING.

Candyce Reynolds has moved divisions, from All Others to CLAS, and therefore resigned her Senate seat. Her replacement is Esther O'Grady.

### **Provost's Report**

TETREAULT noted she would begin by summarizing what she learned in her first quarter at PSU. TETREAULT stated she is very impressed with the quality of the faculty; and how many people in the institution care deeply about it and she appreciates the President's commitment to the institution. Good administration is based on a relationship of mutuality, as well as knowing what each individual brings to the job. Based on this year's experience with approvals for faculty appointments, the Provost and the Deans plan to review proposals for Fall 2001 new hires this Spring, rather than next year. TETREAULT stated she is taking very seriously the Senate's request for her to review recommendations related to the University Studies program, and she has spoken with many people regarding the issues.

TETREAULT indicated that certain structures are being put into place at this time. The first regards strategic priorities. A "Strategic Resource Plan" was drafted and reviewed by the Deans and recently the draft was shared with the Budget Committee. The document was developed so that we can achieve consensus and clarity about what our resource priorities are and will be. This will become the criteria by which we will make

budget decisions. It is designed to reflect both what we are and what we should be. Faculty can obtain copies through their department chairs and are encouraged to comment on the plan. The second structure involves budgeting. Working with Deans, the Budget Committee, and others, the Vice President for Finance & Administration and the Provost have developed a Budget Process to guide deliberations and allocations for next year and future years. Again, an effort has been made to establish clarity about priorities, enrollment targets, and resources. Although the new budget model is enrollment-based, we must take two things into account: our vision of what we can be, and our priorities. Enrollment is not the only issue. In January and February, budgeting activity will begin, and in March, executive groups, for example, Provost and Deans, Deans and Dept. Chairs, etc., will finalize proposals for 2000-2001. When the proposals have been reviewed there will be hearings that include the Executive Committee and the Budget Committee. The final decisions will be communicated to the university community by May or June. At an appropriate time, assessment of those decisions will also take place. In summary, we are trying to develop broad based discussions and a clear process. In subsequent years, we would expect to start the process in Fall quarter.

Two other items of importance are articulating a vision for graduate education and developing an appropriate plan, should it become a priority in the next biennium. This activity has started with a review of the Report by the Task Committee on Graduate Education.

A. JOHNSON noted that year after year we are unable to make budget decisions in a schedule which acknowledges the March bulletin deadlines. TETREAULT noted she understands the problem, and would like people to share their ideas about it. She stated that enrollment is up 6.8% for Winter 2000, and continues strong for the present. Even under opportune conditions, we will most likely have to do a certain amount of forecasting. ZELICK asked for a clarification regarding graduate education. PERNSTEINER noted that graduate enrollment is capped statewide except for a few targeted programs, including our ED program. BLEILER asked if we aren't better off to fill the empty seats in graduate classes so that our enrollment increases. TETREAULT stated yes, but we must remember there is substantially more to graduate education than seat time.

FISHER asked when the deadline will be for requests for new faculty for Fall 2001. Tetreault stated that March will be the deadline for Deans' requests. BECKER asked if the quota for new enrollment we have been given keeps rolling up in subsequent years. TETREAULT stated, no. PERNSTEINER stated that the Chancellor sets the quota each year, based on data such as projected high school graduates, etc. This year it was 6.2% and the preliminary figure for next year is 5%. Given enrollments statewide this past

fall, the latter figure will probably not hold up. TETREAULT added that she is working on better methods for predicting enrollment for future years.

#### **D. QUESTION PERIOD**

- 1. Questions for Administrators**
- 2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair**

#### **E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES**

##### **1. Report of the IFS Meeting of 3-4 December 1999**

The Presiding Officer recognized Jack Cooper to present the report, noting his imminent retirement from the university and his many services to the faculty over the years. Cooper was greeted by the assembly with sustained applause in his honor. The report is attached.

BLEILER/GOSLIN MOVED the Faculty Senate support the resolution concerning PEBB benefits coverage which IFS passed at the meeting (see attached).

KOCH noted that, regarding the foreign travel issue, the problem exists for faculty traveling inside the U.S., as well as abroad, and also applies to our dependents.

BECKER noted that the travel issue is in addition to the overall deterioration of benefits this year.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

##### **2. Curriculum Committee Annual Report**

GELMON presented the report for the committee. SESTAK accepted the report for the Senate.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED, the UCC recommendation: that the new course proposal form be modified to require individuals proposing new courses to indicate that the course is anticipated to become part of an existing junior cluster. The changes to the form will include 1) name of the cluster, 2) how this course fits into the existing cluster, and 3) signature from the University studies committee chair (in addition to the usual authorizing signatures).

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED the UCC recommendation: that a process be established whereby UCC will approve proposals for addition/deletion of existing courses to approved clusters three times per year (January, May and October). Information provided to UCC will include the name of the cluster, a list of existing classes already approved for the cluster, the name and number of course(s) to be added/dropped, a rationale for this action, signatures of all appropriate curricular officials and the University Studies committee chair.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED "the Faculty Senate charge the Steering Committee to form an ad hoc committee to analyze the merits and barriers of continued use of cross-listed courses and omnibus numbers, with specific attention to:

- What is best for assisting students to identify and register for courses?
- What is most helpful for faculty advising?
- What is the most beneficial for University Studies?
- What will assist in allocation of credit hours?
- What produces the most useful transcript of courses taken?
- What are the implications for the implementation of DARS and for Institutional Research?

This committee should report back to the Senate by the May Senate meeting with specific recommendations."

KOCH asked for what the purpose the motion had been proposed. GELMON stated that auditing and student understanding/comprehension are the principle reasons. ZELICK stated that the committee composition suggested by UCC amounted to the "tail wagging the dog" and urged that CLAS be represented on the committee. BRENNER agreed, noting that graduate faculty should also be represented. HOLLOWAY stated, as former UCC Chair, that this is a difficult and not new issue. PRATT suggested, as former UCC Chair, that Holloway be named to the group, and that the omnibus numbered courses are the bigger of the two problems.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

### **3. Graduate Council Annual Report**

BURNS presented the report for Eder, who was unable to attend. BRENNER and ENNEKING asked for clarification regarding the need for a graduate student conduct policy.

FEYERHERM noted that the statement in the OAR's applies to undergraduates.

BRENNER noted the on-line service for investigating plagiarism. HOPP noted that the PSU reference librarians have graciously performed this service in the past.

SESTAK accepted the report for Senate.

### **4. Library Committee Annual Report**

ZELICK presented the report and took questions.

FARR questioned the remark in the report concerning dissatisfaction with library services. ZELICK stated there was some evidence for his statement. FARR noted that the report contained strong language considering the lack of data to support it.

SESTAK accepted the report for Senate.

### **5. Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report**

DIETERICH presented the report for Barham, who was unable to attend.

SESTAK accepted the report for Senate.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED the Senate request that the Provost, in conjunction with the Council of Academic Deans, inform the PSU instructional faculty about the appropriate use of "X's and 'I's" in the grading system. This information should also be made available to all new and continuing faculty on a regular basis. All means necessary should be used to alert faculty of this concern.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.



## **6. University Planning Council Quarterly Report**

LATIOLAIS presented the report for Limbaugh, who was unable to attend.

A. JOHNSON asked if water quality was included in the Facilities discussion. MERCER asked if air quality in Neuberger Hall was included in the Facilities discussion.

SESTAK accepted the report for the Senate.

## **F. Unfinished Business**

None

## **G. New Business**

### **1. Curriculum Committee Course and Program Changes/Proposals**

GELMON presented the proposals, noting that Senators should strike courses numbered MTH490/590 through MTH 496/596 (top of page 2) from the list.

BLEILER/BURNS MOVED the Senate approve the proposals ("G1") as revised.

ERSKINE asked if Art Department proposals were denied. GELMON stated they will be forwarded next month.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

### **2. Name Change: Dept. of Communication**

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED the Senate approve "G2," the name change as proposed.

A. JOHNSON noted that Journalism falls under such a rubric. HOLLOWAY agreed that this designation crosses over with new areas in English. FARR stated he agreed with A. Johnson - the implication is that the title is too broad and slightly misleading. BURNS and LATIOLAIS noted, on the other hand, that this is becoming a common department name across the country. ERSKINE stated the title is too broad, and overlaps into media curricula in Art.

THE QUESTION was called.

THE MOTION PASSED by a vote of 32 in favor, 11 opposed, and 10 abstentions.

**3. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals**

BURNS introduced the proposals for Eder, who was out of town.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "G3," graduate course changes and proposals.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

**H. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Report to the PSU Senate  
on the December, 1999 meeting of the  
Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

We met at Portland State on the afternoon of Friday, December 3 and the morning of Saturday, December 4. We were greeted on behalf of the University by President Dan Bernstine. Then Kathi Ketcheson of the Portland State Office of Institutional Research spoke to us about problems associated with assessment and applying the new model. She said that institutions do not yet have clear rules from central administration on how to apply the new budget model, so that there is a problem of having uniformity of accounting among the institutions. She was clearly aware of the dangers of mere "bottom-line" thinking, that is, of simply applying resources on the basis of mere numbers. There are still technical difficulties to address, such as how to record double-listed courses. On the issue of assessment, she pointed out that the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges is now requiring that the success of students be evaluated as part of the accreditation process. At present, the policy at PSU is to have departments be in charge of assessing their own students.

Mary Kay Tetreault then addressed us. She said that she has always been a strong believer in faculty governance, as exemplified by IFS. She spoke about the reasons for her being attracted to PSU, and foresaw Portland State's becoming the model urban university for the country. She saw the boundaries between city and university becoming blurred, with the city being a laboratory for university research and the university, through such instruments as the Institute of Metropolitan Studies and the Hatfield School, helping the city solve its problems.

Our next guest was Tom Imeson, President of the Board of Higher Education. He summarized the process by which the System was able to increase funding this year. Both the Republican legislature and the Governor wanted to increase support for higher education, the Governor preferring to do it over two years. The Legislature, in increasing funding in a single year, will be reluctant to do more for us in the next biennium. The best way of increasing funding will be to focus on a few very visible items; faculty salaries, he said, is not one of them. The Board held a renewal retreat this month, but it is still trying to define its role. They will certainly spend less time approving programs. He did not foresee either the likelihood or the desirability of a new, independent campus in Bend. He warned that the new budget model might encourage individual campuses to compete for the same students, and he said that will not play well with the legislature. In response to a question from a Senator from Southern, he acknowledged that the smaller, regional institutions have a problem with economies of scale, but that the budget, as applied, has addressed that. Finally, he said that he did not want to see an overemphasis on technical education, that the liberal arts are still central to our mission.

Our next speaker was Nancy Goldschmidt, Policy Analyst for the Oregon University System. She has been involved in developing the Performance Indicators that are to be used to evaluate the institutions. The pressure for such evaluation comes , as I

have said, in part from our accrediting agency, but also from the Oregon Progress Board, Business, and the Legislature, under Senate Bill 109. The Board adopted four goals to be evaluated: Access, Quality, Cost-Effectiveness, and Employability. For the system, \$735 thousand has been set aside to be tied to performance indicators. At present, the only goals being specifically quantified are under access, and they are to increase the number of Oregon High School graduates attending the system and to improve the retention of Freshmen.

Finally, Denise Yunker, the Benefits Manager for OUS spoke to us about negotiations concerning separating OUS unclassified personnel from PEBB. Many faculty in particular have argued that the needs of faculty are different from those of other state employees, particularly because of the need to travel internationally for professional reasons, so that HMO coverage is not adequate. The issue is politically delicate, because uniting all state employees under one system was very much the Governor's initiative. The Governor, however, has not been adamantly opposed, and we have legislative authority to withdraw if we can achieve the same benefits at less cost. As Denise Yunker stated it, she sees that the issue is one of faculty compensation and the need to retain excellent faculty in the system.

The Saturday meeting, as is customary, involved only Senators, with no outside speakers. A rather free ranging discussion raised a number of issues. There was unanimity that the issue of faculty salaries must continually be pressed by faculty organizations. We felt a lack of clear direction in the system as to how issues of cooperation and competition will be worked out. We passed a resolution that I have distributed to you in support of the goal of withdrawing from PEBB, a motion based on one passed at OSU. We are in the process of bringing our constitution up to date, but a motion was passed to allow a retiring President to continue to attend for a year after the end of his or her term and serve as a voting member. Before we elected our new officers, we addressed and deplored the fact that a nominee for President for 2000 had to withdraw his candidacy because his Provost would not support his request for released time. Our new officers are Gary Tiedeman from OSU, President, Ann Tedarts from UO as Vice President, Bob Brandon of EOU as Secretary, and Paul Simonds of UO as Academic Council Representative.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Cooper  
Professor of English

Resolution Passed by the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate on December 4,  
1999

WHEREAS the creation of a unified Public Employment Benefits Board (PEBB) has altered the faculty benefits offered as compensation for service to the Oregon University System; and

WHEREAS the planning of benefit packages under PEBB has largely ignored the frequently expressed critical needs of the faculty of OUS; and

WHEREAS the current PEBB benefit system contains a structure of subsidies that discriminates against faculty-preferred options (as revealed in PEBB surveys); and

WHEREAS the PEBB-administered benefits represent a substantial reduction in benefits and an increase in costs for most faculty; and

WHEREAS faculty as a group may represent a relatively low-cost pool of beneficiaries; and

WHEREAS the originating legislation (SB271) said the System "may elect, at the discretion of the State Board of Higher Education, to provide alternative benefits plans to its employees, should the same level of benefits be available at a lower cost;"

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate of the Oregon University System approve a petition to request that the Board of the Oregon University System work with due haste to develop and implement a plan to separate faculty health-care benefits from PEBB control by developing a system of benefits governance that is more responsive to faculty concerns and more cost effective in meeting faculty health-care needs.

At the 7 June 1999 meeting, the PSU Faculty Senate moved the following recommendations of the Steering Committee by unanimous voice vote, respectively:

1. The Senate accepts the reports of the **ARC**, UCC and the Budget Committee; adopt their **recommendations**(Item F.1., p. 3) and ask the Administration to respond at the meeting of the Faculty Senate in November, 1999.
2. The Senate accepts the report of the **UPC** and asks the Provost's Office and the Dean of CLAS to present at the Faculty Senate Meeting of **10 January, 2000**, their plan for University Studies as concerns structure, organizational locus, management, and budgetary arrangements.

Regarding the first motion, the ARC recommendations are herein included. The Senate voted at the 4 October, 1999, meeting to request the Provost to postpone that response until January 2000, to allow sufficient time for a considered response.

Regarding writing:

It is critical to recognize that the scope of this "problem" extends into all aspects of students' educational experience at PSU. *We urge in the strongest possible terms that the University initiate a process of testing to determine the quality and character of student writing. Highest priority should be given to describing what we mean by merely acceptable to excellent writing and then testing incoming as well as exiting students. Assessment should have some payoff for the students who undergo it as well as the institution. If performance is lacking, courses must be made available that will invest students with the writing skills they need at PSU and beyond.*

Preliminary steps might involve:


- *In cooperation with high school and community college faculty, taking a look at samples of students' writing when they enter PSU (entrants from high school as well as transfer students);*
- *Some systematic sampling of writing from FRINQ and SINQ courses, as well as from those taking part in CAPSTONEs.*
- *Information regarding the resources and policies surrounding writing at "feeder" schools is a prerequisite to any action taken by PSU.*
- *Attention should be paid to special populations (non-native English speakers, speakers of nonstandard varieties).*

# PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

E1

Date: December 6, 1999

To: Sarah Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty Senate

From:  Brad Hansen, Chair of the **Faculty Development Committee**  
(list of members attached)

Subject: **Semi-Annual Report to the Faculty Senate**

---

1. Committee member Kathi Ketcheson met with the Office of Graduate Studies and Research to make revisions to the Request for Proposals for the current year. The Call for Proposals went out to faculty mailboxes this week. A copy it appears on the PSU web site
2. A line item was added to the budget worksheet for all proposals to include Graduate Assistant tuition remission at \$1,838 per term.
3. We are assuming that the same dollar amount will be awarded this year as last year, approximately \$150,000. This is yet to be determined in the AAUP contract.
4. In January, 2000, a meeting will be scheduled for the committee and Bill Feyerherm from the Office of Graduate Studies and Research to establish the schedule for review of proposals and dates for allocating funds.
5. The Faculty Senate will need to appoint a new chair for this committee, due to the fact that I will be leaving my current position at PSU in January. I have truly enjoyed serving on the Faculty Development Committee the past three years, and have been impressed by the quality of the research our excellent faculty has performed.

cc: B. Sestak

## ALL UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

FACULTY  
DEVELOPMENT  
COMMITTEE*Established by Faculty Constitution  
Article IV, Section 4g.*

The Faculty Development Committee reviews proposals and makes recommendations to the Provost on awards to faculty, including those of the Research and Scholarship and Institutional Career Support-Peer Review Programs. The Faculty Development Committee is scheduled to make a report to the Faculty Senate at least twice yearly: December 6, 1999 and May 1, 2000.

MEMBERS TO SERVE 1999-00 ACADEMIC YEAR  
PRIOR SERVICE IN PARENTHESES

- Chairperson: Brad Hansen, XS (XS-IS) (1996-)  
5-4803 • 25 FAB  
hansenb@pdx.edu
- Faculty: Michelle Gamburd, CLAS (ANTH) (1997-)  
Leung Pui, CLAS (PHY) (1997-)  
Martha Works, CLAS (GEOG) (1997-)  
Thomas Kinderman, CLAS (PSY)  
Jie Lin, CLAS (CHEM)  
Sharon Elteto, LIB (1997-)  
Oren Ogle, LIB  
Wendelin Mueller, EAS (CE) (1997-)  
Emily de la Cruz, ED (C&I) (1998-)  
Theresa Julnes-Rapida, UPA (PA) (1998-)  
Ketcheson, Kathi, AO (OIRP)(1998-)  
Thomas Gillpatrick, SBA  
Pauline Jivanjee, GSSW  
Stephen Martin, SFPA (MUS)
- Mentor: Beverly Fuller 1998-99 Chair
- Consultants: Mary Kay Tetreault, Provost  
William Feyerherm, Vice Provost for Research  
& Dean of Graduate Studies



December 13, 1999

MEMO TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Sherril Gelmon, Chair  
University Curriculum Committee


RE: Recommended Curriculum Proposals

The following were reviewed by UCC at its December 1999 meeting and are recommended for approval by the Senate.

1. Final approval of the African Studies Cluster within University Studies. Additional materials have been submitted that clarify the concern regarding the content for the major vs. the content for the cluster.
  
2. Proposals from the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences:  
 BS in Computer Science: change catalog statement; approved  
 CS 481/581 and 482/582: split sequence (create two items in the catalog); approved  
 CS 485: proposal for new 400 level course (585 already exists); approved  
 ME 437/537: change course description and prerequisites; approved
  
3. Proposals from Department of Art  
 ArH 456/556, 457/557, 458/558: change course description; approved  
 ArH 490/590: change credit hours and prerequisites; approved  
 Art 230, 231: new course; approved  
 Art 270, 271: add 271 to sequence, change credit hours, description, prerequisites; approved  
 Art 281, 282: add 282 to sequence, change credit hours, title, description, prerequisites; approved  
 Art 391: change credit hours, title, description, prerequisites; approved  
 Art 392, 393, 394: change course number, credit hours, description, prerequisites; approved  
 Art 479/579: change credit hours, description, prerequisites; approved [graduate level course is also being added but this is not purview of UCC]  
 Art 490/590: change credit hours, description, prerequisites; approved  
 Art 491/591: change credit hours, title, description, prerequisites; approved
  
4. Proposals from Division of Political Science  
 PS 353: new course; approved  
 PS 354: new course; approved  
 PS 454/554: change course number (from PS 444/544) as part of creation of sequence; approved [note: proposal had deleted prerequisite, but UCC retained the prerequisite of PS 205 or 441]  
 PS 455/555: new course; approved with prerequisite of PS 454 [as this is proposed as part of a sequence]  
 PS 482/582: change title, course description; approved with following: retain recommended PS 381 in course description.  
 PS 483/583: change title and course description; approved  
 PS 484/584: new course; approved  
 PS 486/586: change title and description; approved

December 13, 1999

MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty Senate   
 From: Bob Eder, Chair, Graduate Council  
 Re: Recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate:  
 A. New / Revised course proposals (School of Business)  
 B. Add options in the MBA in Finance & International Business (School of Business Adm.)  
 C. New / Revised course proposals (CLAS)

A. The following new / revised course proposals by the School of Business Administration are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate:

FINL 569	Advanced Financial Management (Expanded course description; Change from 3 to 4 credit hours)
FINL 573	Investment Analysis and Portfolio Management (Expanded course description; Change from 3 to 4 credit hours)
FINL 474 / 574	Portfolio Management: Issues and Performance Assessment (2 credits) (New advanced applications course)
FINL 512	Business Law (4 credits) (Undergraduate FINL 412 already being taught)

B. The following two options in the MBA are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate:

Please note: The Faculty Senate previously approved a Management of Innovation & Technology (MIT) option within the MBA. If approved, MBA students would have the opportunity to concentrate their electives also in either Finance or International Business. Each option is supported by the recently approved MS in Financial Analysis (MSFA) degree program and the Masters in International Management (MIM) degree program.

MBA – Finance Option (MBA is a minimum 72 credit hour degree program)

Required MBA Courses                      49 credit hours

FINL 552 Investments (4)  
 FINL 565 Cases in Corporate Financial Management (4)  
 BA 506 Business Project with a focus on Finance (6) (Project required of all MBAs)

Additional elective courses from an approved list (9 credit hours minimum)

MBA – International Business Option (MBA is a minimum 72 credit hour degree program)

Required MBA Courses                      49 credit hours

MIM 516 Contemporary Pacific Rim & World Affairs (3)

MIM 518 Managing Multinational Organizations (3)

BA 506 Business Project with a focus on International Business (6)

Additional elective courses from an approved list (11 credit hours minimum)

C. The following new / revised course proposals by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences (CLAS) are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate:

Anthropology

ANTH 442 / 542 Contemporary American Indian Policy (3 credit hours)  
(new course proposal)

Biology

BI 473 / 573 Field Sampling (4 credit hours)  
(new course proposal)

Dropping:     BI 437 / 537 & BI 438 / 538 Cell Physiology (3 credit hours each)  
                    BI 439 / 539 & BI 440 / 540 Cell Physiology Lab (2 credit hours each)  
                    BI 470 / 570 General Ecology II (3 credit hours)

Foreign Languages & Literatures (All new course proposals)

FLL 447 / 547 Major Forces in World Literature - Literary Forms (4 credit hours)

FLL 448 / 548 Major Forces in World Literature – Major Writers (4 credit hours)

FLL 449 / 549 Major Forces in World Literature & Culture (4 credit hours)

Please note: There were also a number of minor changes in course titles or catalogue descriptions for several Economics courses that were simply handled administratively.